

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (01-09)

Approved for use through 02/28/2009. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) S63.2-11032-US01											
<p>I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]</p> <p>on _____</p> <p>Signature _____</p> <p>Typed or printed name _____</p>		Application Number 10/749821	Filed 12/31/2003										
		First Named Inventor Burgmeier et al.											
		Art Unit 1791	Examiner Monica Anne Huson										
<p>Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.</p> <p>This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.</p> <p>The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.</p> <p>I am the</p> <table border="0"><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.</td><td>/Walter J. Steinkraus/</td></tr><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)</td><td>Signature Walter J. Steinkraus</td></tr><tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number 29592</td><td>Typed or printed name 952-563-3000</td></tr><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____</td><td>Telephone number 4/10/2009</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>Date</td></tr></table> <p>NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> *Total of _____ forms are submitted.</p>				<input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.	/Walter J. Steinkraus/	<input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)	Signature Walter J. Steinkraus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number 29592	Typed or printed name 952-563-3000	<input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____	Telephone number 4/10/2009		Date
<input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.	/Walter J. Steinkraus/												
<input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)	Signature Walter J. Steinkraus												
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. Registration number 29592	Typed or printed name 952-563-3000												
<input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____	Telephone number 4/10/2009												
	Date												

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.8. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Burgmeier, et al
Application No.: 10/749821
Filed: December 31, 2003
For: MEDICAL DEVICE WITH VARYING PHYSICAL PROPERTIES AND
METHOD FOR FORMING SAME
Examiner: Monica Anne Huson
Group Art Unit: 1791

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Docket No.: S63.2B-11032-US01

REASONS FOR PREAPPEAL CONFERENCE

Independent claim 20 is directed to an method of forming a polymeric part for a medical device that involves emission of mass of material such that it has at least two regions located within in a single layer of the emitted mass along the length thereof with differing amounts of crystallization modifier in the two regions of the single layer. The method allows one to vary physical properties within the layer. This provides a method of varying the physical properties along the length of a device such as a catheter or balloon. Particular embodiments, to which some of the dependent claims are directed relate to the use in making tubes for making balloons, and in making balloons produced therewith, including location of the modifiers at particular balloon sites along the length that provide specific disclosed benefits.

Claim Rejections 35 USC §103

Claims 20-25, 29-30, 6-7, 9-11, and 13-14 have been rejected as obvious from Wang, et al, US 6,465,067 ("Wang") in view of Forte et al US 2003/005161 ("Forte").

When determining obviousness using a combination of references, the prior art must be considered as a whole, without the benefit of the impermissible hindsight vision afforded by the claimed invention. The prior art must be applied in the context of their significance to a technician at the time the invention was made, without knowledge of the applicant's invention. Taking into account the evidence of common knowledge and the common sense of the skilled person, there must be some evidence of a suggestion, teaching or motivation that would have led

the skilled person to produce the invention as claimed. *In re Translogic Technology Inc.*, 84 USPQ2D 1929, 1937 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *Ortho-Mcneil Pharmaceutical Inc. v. Mylan Laboratories Inc.* 86 USPQ2D 1196, 1201-1202 (Fed. Cir. 2008). It is impermissible, simply to engage in hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention, using the applicant's structure as a template, picking and choosing among isolated disclosures in the various documents to supply elements to fill the gaps. MPEP 2142, explicitly requires that the examiner step backward in time to determine whether the invention as a whole would have been obvious to a skilled person without knowledge of the invention. Similarly *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ___, ___, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (US Sup. Ct. 2007) states: "[R]ejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness."

The rejection clearly fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of the invention of independent claim 20. At least for this reason the rejection fails as to all of the rejected claims.

Wang shows variation of composition between different layers of an tubing extrusion for a medical balloon, it does not show or suggest variation between two regions of a single layer of material. The location of the differences are in a direction radially through the thickness of the tubing, not along the length. The Office Action does not explain why a skilled person would have sought to modify a balloon or balloon tubing of Wang to have variation of crystallization modifier along the length of a single layer, rather than between different layers.

The Office Action contends that Forte "shows that it is known to carry out a method of making ***an extruded polymeric article*** wherein the crystallization modifier can be present ***in any desired distribution or fashion***, depending on the desired article" (emphasis added). This assertion is clearly wrong. The assertion attributes to Forte teachings that are not found or suggested anywhere in the document.

Firstly, as to "an extruded polymeric article," Forte pertains to packaging film that tears easily. It relates neither to extruded polymer articles generally nor to medical devices particularly. The Office Action fails to articulate a reason why one would combine the Wang et al and Forte documents in fashioning a medical device part.

In particular why would one look to techniques for preparing tearable packaging

film when forming medical balloons of the type described by Wang? The Final Office Action completely ignores this question that was posed in the 11/26/2008 response. Generally one wants medical balloons to have high tear strengths. Forte's tearable film compositions would not be of interest to a person making tubing for a Wang balloon.

Secondly, Final Action, contends that it has articulated a reason for modification in stating that Forte shows a method of "making extruded polymeric article wherein the crystallization modifier can be present in any desired distribution or fashion, depending on the desired article." This statement is false, but even if we treated it as true for the purposes of argument, it is not a reason for modification of Wang et al to vary composition along the length of a single layer. This is exactly the "mere conclusory statement" that the *KSR* decision ***explicitly prohibits***. Wang teaches to vary properties between layers, not within layers. Forte doesn't provide a reason to vary the properties within any of Wang's layers. The Examiner is merely assuming that the skilled person wants to make the claimed variation. Nothing in either Wang or Forte justifies this assumption. The Final Action simply ignores the requirement that the prior art must make obvious the subject matter as claimed, not merely some generic process broader than the claims at issue.

Thirdly, to support the "any desired distribution or fashion" assertion, the Final Office Action cites paragraphs 0013, 0014, 0036, 0040, 0041. Those paragraphs are reproduced below in their entirety with emphasis added:

[0013] The film may be a single layer film or a multilayer film. In multilayer embodiment, skin layers with standard homopolymer polypropylene and no hcPP may encapsulate a core layer that includes hcPP and standard homopolymer polypropylene resins. Because the more crystalline core layer is positioned between two less crystalline layers, the film is more easily processed and has increased durability. Another multilayer embodiment has a core layer and two skin layer, each of the three layers containing hcPP resin.

[0014] The amount of hcPP resin contained within each layer may vary according to the properties desired in the film. ***For example, all layers may contain the same amount of hcPP resin.*** As a result, the layers have similar or the same viscosities and may be simultaneously co-extruded on standard co-extrusion equipment without the addition of processing acids.

[0036] The inventive film may be a single layer film or multilayer film, extruded by conventional extrusion or coextrusion processes well known in the art. ***The polymer resins for each layer are melted and mixed with any additives in an extruder.*** The resins

are then extruded (or coextruded in the case of multilayer films) through a slot die.

[0040] In multilayer embodiments ***the core layer preferably contains greater amounts of hcPP than the skin layers***. In some embodiments, one or both of the skin layers may include no highly crystalline polypropylene. An embodiment ***with at least one hcPP-free skin layer*** will make the film more durable because it protects the crystalline, easy to tear core layer. Similarly, ***skin layers with less hcPP than the core*** provide some protection and added durability.

[0041] ***Alternatively, the skin layers and core layer may have identical amounts of hcPP***. As discussed above, coextrusion of layers with similar or the same viscosities may be simultaneously coextruded on standard coextrusion equipment without the addition of processing agents to increase or decrease viscosity of the resins. Therefore, embodiments with similar or identical amounts of hcPP may have good processing efficiency.

Nothing in these paragraphs says anything about a crystallization modifier being present "in any desired distribution or fashion." Note specifically that the Final Action has improperly taken the first sentence from paragraph 40:

The amount of hcPP resin contained within each layer may vary according to the properties desired in the film

out of the context provided by the very next sentence:

For example, all layers may contain the same amount of hcPP resin.

which exemplifies compositions of ***different layers***, not of the same layer. The Final Office Action clearly does not step backward in time to read this art in the context it would have been given by a skilled person without knowledge of the invention, as required MPEP 2142. Nothing in the first quoted sentence above or anywhere else indicates that a person would desire to vary film properties of the tearable film along its length. The ***only*** variations discussed anywhere in the cited paragraphs are of variations between layers.

Review of Forte in its entirety reveals that when compositional variation is described it is either 1) a choice of a particular composition from a range of available compositions, or 2) compositional variation between layers. This is not "any desired distribution or fashion." No reasonable reading of Forte et al as a whole in the context it would have been given by a skilled person before the present invention would lead a skilled person to conclude that the document teaches or suggests use of any crystallization modifier in ***every*** possible distribution or fashion for ***any*** extruded article. The Final Action makes a fictionalized generalization that is

not justified by an objective prospective reading of Forte, and does so retrospectively - with reference to the applicant's disclosure. ***This is impermissible hindsight by definition.***

The rejection fails to articulate a reasonable basis for combining the Wang and Forte documents; fails to show any reason why one would be motivated to vary Wang's tubing composition in a single layer along the length of the extrusion as claimed; and is founded on an impermissible fictional reconstruction of the Forte teachings. At least for these reasons the claimed invention is not obvious from Wang in view of Forte. Withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: April 10, 2009

By: /Walter J. Steinkraus/
Walter J. Steinkraus
Registration No.: 29592

6640 Shady Oak Dr., Suite 400
Eden Prairie, MN 55344-7834
Telephone: (952) 563-3000
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001